## Computability Theory: Decidability and Recognizability

- Encoding Turing Machines and the Universal TM
- Computability
- Undecidable Problems using Diagnolization
- The Halting and Accept Problems
- Turing Reductions
- Mapping Reductions
- Undecidable and Unrecognizable Problems
- Rice Theorem

## Imdad ullah Khan

# **Computability Questions**

Some meta-computational problems (problems about computations)

•  $A_{DFA} = \{ \langle D, w \rangle : D \text{ a DFA over } \Sigma, D \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \leftrightarrow w \in L(D) \}$ 

•  $A_{NFA} = \{ \langle N, w \rangle : N \text{ a NFA over } \Sigma, N \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \leftrightarrow w \in L(N) \}$ 

•  $A_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ a TM over } \Sigma, M \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \}$ 

• HALT  $_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ a TM over } \Sigma, M \text{ halts on } w \in \Sigma^* \}$ 

#### Theorem

There is a Turing machine U that takes as input an encoding of an arbitrary Turing machine M over  $\Sigma$  and a string  $w \in \Sigma^*$  such that U accepts  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if and only if M accepts w

In other words, the language  $A_{TM}$  is Turing-recognizable.

There is no Universal DFA/NFA

In other words,  $A_{DFA}$  and  $A_{NFA}$  are not regular

 $A_{DFA} = \{ \langle D, w \rangle : D \text{ a DFA over } \Sigma, \ D \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \leftrightarrow w \in L(D) \}$ 

DFA is a special case of a Turing Machine.

Run the universal TM U on  $\langle D, w \rangle$  and output the answer of D on w

 $A_{NFA} = \{ \langle N, w \rangle : N \text{ an NFA over } \Sigma, N \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \leftrightarrow w \in L(N) \}$ 

NFA = DFA is a special case of a Turing Machine.

Run the universal TM U on  $\langle N, w \rangle$  and output the answer of N on w

### $A_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ a TM over } \Sigma, M \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \}$

Run the universal TM U on  $\langle M, w \rangle$  and output the answer of M on w

 $A_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ a TM over } \Sigma, \ M \text{ accepts } w \in \Sigma^* \}$ 

Run the universal TM U on  $\langle M, w \rangle$  and accept if M accepts w

 $\operatorname{HALT}_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ a TM over } \Sigma, M \text{ halts on } w \in \Sigma^* \}$ 

Run the universal TM U on  $\langle M,w\rangle$  and accept if M does halt and reject otherwise

 $\operatorname{HALT}_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ a TM over } \Sigma, M \text{ halts on } w \in \Sigma^* \}$ 

Run the universal TM U on  $\langle M, w \rangle$  and accept if M does halt

#### There are non-recognizable languages

Assuming Church-Turing thesis, this means there are problems that no computing device can ever solve ▷ Non-Computable Problems

We prove this first result of computability theory by a counting argument

We show that there are more problems than there are Turing machines



### Existence of non-recognizable languages

There are more problems than there are Turing machines

For any set A there is no onto function from A to  $\mathcal{P}(A)$ 

**Proof:** Suppose  $f : A \mapsto \mathcal{P}(A)$  is an onto function.

Note that for  $x \in A$ ,  $f(x) \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ , i.e.  $f(x) \subseteq A$ 

Define  $S \subset A := \{x \in A : x \notin f(x)\}$ 

Since f is onto, the set S has a pre-image i.e. for some  $x \in A$ , f(x) = S

- If  $x \in S$ , then  $x \notin f(x) = S$
- If  $x \notin S$ , then  $x \in f(x) = S$

$$\therefore \quad \forall x \in A, \ f(x) \neq S$$
, meaning  $f$  is not onto

No matter what the set A is,  $\mathcal{P}(A)$  has strictly larger cardinality than A

### Existence of non-recognizable languages

There are more problems than there are Turing machines

For any set A there is no onto function from A to  $\mathcal{P}(A)$ 

Let  ${\mathcal M}$  be the set of all Turing machines

 $\mathcal{M} \subset \{0,1\}^* = B$ 

Let  ${\mathcal L}$  be the set of all languages over  $\{0,1\}$ 

since a language is a subset of B, we get  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{P}(B)$ 

Suppose every language is recognizable, i.e.

 $\forall L \in \mathcal{L}, \exists M \in \mathcal{M} \text{ such that } L(M) = L$ 

The mapping  $R : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{L}$ , such that R(M) = L(M) is an onto function  $\triangleright$  a contradiction